



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,904	01/24/2002	Jeffrey D. Carr	1875.1310002	3811
49579	7590	04/13/2006	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			BAUM, RONALD	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2136		

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/053,904	CARR, JEFFREY D.
	Examiner Ronald Baum	Art Unit 2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01022003.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in reply to applicant's correspondence of 11 February 2006.
2. Claims 1- 22 are pending for examination.
3. Claims 1- 22 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The claims 12, 19, 20 rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1- 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ellington et al,

U.S. Patent 6,708,218 B1.

4. As per claim 1; “A method of processing a packet having a plurality of layers, comprising:

processing a first layer in accordance with a first protocol [ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol

field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner]; and

processing a second layer in accordance with a second protocol in parallel with

processing of said first layer when processing of said first layers uncovers

sufficient information to support processing of said second layer

[ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 1-54, col. 4, lines 25-col. 5, line 21, figures 3-11 and

associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or

an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header (i.e., first

layer) as examined in the data link control (i.e., second) layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-

54), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the

examiner].”.

5. As per claim 2; “A method of processing a data packet according to a plurality of security policies, comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving the packet;

(b) identifying a first security policy;

(c) processing the packet according to

the first security policy [ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 1-54, col. 4, lines 25-col. 5, line

21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as

being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header

as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec

inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first

security policy), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner];

(d) identifying a second security policy when

information necessary for said identification of the second security policy becomes available; and

(e) processing the packet according to

the second security policy, concurrently with step (c) [ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3,lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., second security policy; layer dependent), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner].”.

As per claim 16, this claim is the apparatus/system for the method claim 2 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 2 rejection; “A system for processing a data packet according to a plurality of security policies, wherein processes that effect respective security policies can execute in parallel, the system comprising:

a packet identification (PID) parser that

identifies the packet;

a plurality of security processing modules, each of which can process the packet according to

one of the security policies in parallel with
at least one other security processing module; and
at least
one feedback loop or
feeding output of at least one of said security processing modules to
at least one other security processing module.”.

6. As per claim 19; this claim is the intended use embodiment of claim 16 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 16 rejection (A recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is *intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art if prior art has the capability to do so perform* (See MPEP 2114 and Ex Parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)). The *prior art is replete with references disclosing generally electrically equivalent embodiments such as that implemented using Digital Video Broadcast (DVB) descrambler hardware.*); “The **method** of claim 16, wherein said security processing modules comprise
a module for performing Digital Video Broadcast (DVB) descrambling.”.

7. Claim 3 **additionally recites** the limitation that; “The method of claim 2, wherein said step (c) comprises
decryption of data in the packet.”.

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a

frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5, lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

8. As per claim 6; this claim is the intended use embodiment of claim 3 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 3 rejection (A recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is *intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art if prior art has the capability to do so perform* (See MPEP 2114 and Ex Parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)). The *prior art is replete with references disclosing generally algorithm/software implemented equivalent embodiments such as that implemented using the ARC4 stream cipher encryption algorithm derivative of the associated* (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" standard of Ellington et al.); "The method of claim 3, wherein
said decryption is performed according to
the ARC4 algorithm."

As per claim 10, this claim is the apparatus/system for the method claim 6 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 6 rejection; "The method of claim 7, wherein

said decryption is performed according to

the ARC4 standard."

9. Claim 4 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 3, wherein said decryption is performed according to

the data encryption standard (DES).".

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 1-54, col. 4, lines 25-col. 5, line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5, lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

As per claim 17, this claim is the apparatus/system for the method claim 4 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 4 rejection; "The system of claim 16, wherein

said security processing modules comprise

a module for performing decryption according to the DES.”.

10. Claim 5 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 3, wherein said decryption is performed according to
the triple data encryption standard (3DES).”.

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 1-54, col. 4, lines 25-col. 5, line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5, lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

As per claim 18, this claim is the apparatus/system for the method claim 5 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 5 rejection; “The system of claim 16, wherein

said security processing modules comprise

a module for performing decryption according to the 3DES.”.

11. Claim 7 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 2, wherein said step (e) comprises decryption of data in the packet."

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 1-54, col. 4, lines 25-col. 5, line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5, lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

12. Claim 8 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 7, wherein said decryption is performed according to the DES."

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 1-54, col. 4, lines 25-col. 5, line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col.

Art Unit: 2136

5,lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

13. Claim 9 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; "The method of claim 7, wherein said decryption is performed according to
the 3DES."

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3,lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5,lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

14. Claim 11 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; "The method of claim 2, wherein said step (e) comprises
authentication of the data packet."

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a

frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated authentication/encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5, lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", section 4.4.1 "The Security Policy Database", where the authentication/encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; AH use of SHA-1/HMAC), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

15. As per claim 12; this claim is the intended use embodiment of claim 11 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 11 rejection (A recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is *intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art if prior art has the capability to do so perform* (See MPEP 2114 and Ex Parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)). The *prior art is replete with references disclosing generally algorithm/software implemented equivalent embodiments such as that implemented using the Multilayer Modular Hashing (MMH) algorithm derivative of the associated* (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" standard of Ellington et al.); "The method of claim 11, wherein
said authentication comprises
application of the **Multilayer Modular Hashing (MMH)** algorithm."

16. Claim 13 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 11, wherein

said authentication comprises

application of the Hash-based Message Authentication Code (HMAC) Secure Hash Algorithm (SHA)-1.”.

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 1-54, col. 4, lines 25-col. 5, line 21; figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3, lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated authentication/encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5, lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", section 4.4.1 "The Security Policy Database", where the authentication/encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; AH use of SHA-1/HMAC), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

As per claim 20, this claim is the apparatus/system for the method claim 13 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 13 rejection; “**The system of claim 16, wherein**

said security processing modules comprise

a module for performing HMAC authentication.”.

17. Claim 14 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 2, wherein
said step (e) comprises

re-encryption of decrypted data from the packet.”.

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3,lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5,lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

18. As per claim 15; this claim is the intended use embodiment of claim 14 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 14 rejection (A recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is *intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art if prior art has the capability to do so perform* (See MPEP 2114 and Ex Parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)). The *prior art is replete with references disclosing generally algorithm/software implemented equivalent embodiments such as that implemented using the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) derivative of the associated (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" standard of Ellington et al.*); “The method of claim 14, wherein

said re-encryption comprises

encryption performed according to the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES).”.

19. Claim 21 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 3, wherein said decryption is performed in application layer processing".

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3,lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security policy) in support of the associated encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5,lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol" where the encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; DES and triple DES), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

20. Claim 22 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 11, wherein said authentication is performed in application layer processing".

The teachings of Ellington et al suggest such limitations (ABSTRACT, col. 3,lines 1-54, col. 4,lines 25-col. 5,line 21, figures 3-11 and associated descriptions, whereas the determination of a frame as being IP frame or an IPSec frame via the MAC header and protocol field in the IP header as examined in the data link control layer (i.e., col. 3,lines 17-54) and said IPSec inherently uses Security association management (SA) and key exchange (i.e., first security

policy) in support of the associated authentication/encryption/decryption cryptographic functions (i.e., col. 5,lines 13-21, (RFC) 2401, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", section 4.4.1 "The Security Policy Database", where the authentication/encryption/decryption cryptographic functions include; AH use of SHA-1/HMAC), clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Response to Amendment

25. As per applicant's argument concerning the lack of teaching by Ellington et al of "processing a first layer ... processing a second layer" aspects, the examiner has fully considered in this response to amendment; the arguments, and finds them not to be persuasive. The claim language (i.e., independent claim 1) is not directed to distinguishing the processing of the layers in a patently distinct manor in an explicit way, just implicitly in a broad sense. The fact that the specification deals more explicitly with the nature of "processing a first layer ... processing a second layer" does not render the requirement that the claim language not deal with this aspect more succinctly; just that said claim language is looked at in light of the specification. Therefore, the "processing a first layer ... processing a second layer" aspects of Ellington et al, such as the processing of the lower layers (i.e., the physical/MAC layers with their specific protocols) inherently preceding the processing of higher level layers (i.e., IP/network layers with their specific protocols), as being *broadly interpreted by the examiner*, as per the claim language, would therefore be applicable in the rejection, such that said reference does not render the claim language limitations patently distinct.

Art Unit: 2136

26. As per applicant's argument concerning the lack of teaching by Ellington et al of "processing a first layer ... processing a second layer" *dependency* aspects, the examiner has fully considered in this response to amendment; the arguments, and finds them not to be persuasive. The "processing a first layer ... processing a second layer" aspects of Ellington et al, are such that the processing of the lower layers (i.e., the physical/MAC layers with their specific protocols) clearly *inherently* precedes the processing of the higher level layers (i.e., IP/network layers) and is therefore not patently distinct, as being *broadly interpreted by the examiner*, as per the claim language, would therefore be applicable in the rejection, such that said reference does not render the claim language limitations patently distinct.

27. As per applicant's argument concerning the lack of teaching by Ellington et al of "processing a first security policy ... processing a second security policy" aspects, the examiner has fully considered in this response to amendment; the arguments, and finds them not to be persuasive. The claim language (i.e., independent claim 2) is not directed to distinguishing the processing of the security policies in a patently distinct manor in an explicit way, just implicitly in a broad sense. The fact that the specification deals more explicitly with the nature of "processing a first security policy ... processing a second security policy" does not render the requirement that the claim language not deal with this aspect more succinctly; just that said claim language is looked at in light of the specification. Therefore, the "processing a first security policy ... processing a second security policy" aspects of Ellington et al, such as the processing of the lower layers inherently preceding the processing of higher level layers whereas the security policies/security associations (i.e., first, second, etc.,) are not explicitly claimed as

distinct (i.e., the same security policy for the first and second security policies/security associations used to process up the stack during packet reception processing), as being *broadly interpreted by the examiner*, as per the claim language, would therefore be applicable in the rejection, such that said reference does not render the claim language limitations patently distinct.

28. As per applicant's argument concerning the lack of teaching by Ellington et al of "packet identification parser ... feedback loop" aspects, the examiner has fully considered in this response to amendment; the arguments, and finds them not to be persuasive. The claim language (i.e., independent claim 16) is not directed to distinguishing the processing of the "packet identification parser ... feedback loop" in a patently distinct manor in an explicit way, just implicitly in a broad sense. The "processing a first layer ... processing a second layer" aspects of Ellington et al, are such that the processing of the lower layers clearly *inherently* preceding the processing of the higher level layers is such that packet identification (i.e., at the very least at the port number processing level) takes place so as to assure subsequent packet processing in the assembly of the packets into a message/session data structure. Clearly, the packet identified by a given packet ID (i.e., the packet port number/source/destination address, etc.,) as processing proceeds up the stack occurs such that the state of the 'previous packet is part of this same message/session' constitutes the feedback aspect, as being *broadly interpreted by the examiner*, as per the claim language, would therefore be applicable in the rejection, such that said reference does not render the claim language limitations patently distinct.

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Ronald Baum, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3861, and whose unofficial Fax number is (571) 273-3861. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached at (571) 272-3795. The Fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. For more information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Baum

Patent Examiner

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Cll 4/11/06

